

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the previous amendments and following remarks.

The subject matter of this application pertains to a stabilizer control apparatus. Before turning to the subject matter recited in independent Claim 1, reference is made to the written description in the application describing various features associated with the stabilizer control apparatus. Referring, for example, to the embodiment illustrated in Fig. 2, a left stabilizer bar SBfl is connected to a stator SR of an electric motor M, and a right stabilizer bar SRfr is connected to a rotor RO of the electric motor M via a speed reducing mechanism RD. As discussed in paragraph [0020] of the written description, the torsional rigidity of the apparatus changes based on the level of electric current I_m fed to the motor M. Furthermore, the speed reducing mechanism RD has both a normal efficiency and a positive reverse efficiency, as illustrated in Fig. 4. Because the speed reducing mechanism RD has a positive reverse efficiency, the torsional rigidity of the apparatus can be gradually decreased as needed.

Turning now to amended independent Claim 1, the claimed stabilizer control apparatus comprises, *inter alia*, a stabilizer including a pair of stabilizer bars disposed between a right wheel and a left wheel of a vehicle, and an actuator disposed between the pair of stabilizer bars and having both an electric motor and a speed reducing mechanism for transmitting power of the electric motor, with a normal efficiency and a positive reverse efficiency.

Claim 1, the only independent claim in this application, is rejected based on a combination of the disclosures of JP8085328 (hereinafter Ito) in view of JP2001277833 (hereinafter Weiss).

The Official Action states that Ito discloses "a speed reducing mechanism for transmitting power of motor with normal and reverse efficiency." Assuming for the sake of discussion that some basis exists for this statement, Ito still does not disclose a speed reducing mechanism having a positive reverse efficiency.

Specifically, Ito's translated paragraph [0043] reads, in relevant part, "the worm gear 4 or HRH gear having a non-reversible characteristic is used for the above-described speed reduction means A, so that economy in electric power has been aimed." Also, Ito's translated paragraph [0053] reads "The reason why the clutch CL1 was installed between the main bevel gear 20 and the speed reduction means A is that, in case of system failure, there is such a possibility that the stabilizers 29, 42 may be held to be twisted, even in the state without rolling, due to the non-reversible characteristic of the worm gear 4, and therefore, it will be separated by the clutch CL1 from the worm gear 4, to avoid such a state as being twisted."

With respect to the above translated excerpts, the speed reduction means A having a non-reversible characteristic means that the torsion will not be transmitted from the wheels back to the motor. Thus, even if the motor is stopped, the torsional rigidity of the apparatus will not be decreased. The clutch CL1 must be actuated in order for the torsional rigidity to decrease, and this decrease will be sudden. Thus, it can be concluded that the speed reduction means A is of no reverse efficiency, i.e., the reverse efficiency is zero. Accordingly, to the extent Ito's speed reduction means

A may be interpreted to correspond to a speed reducing mechanism, the mechanism does not have a positive reverse efficiency as recited in amended Claim 1.

Moreover, Weiss does not cure the above noted deficiencies of Ito.

Claim 1 is therefore allowable, and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1 as being unpatentable over Ito in view of Weiss is respectfully requested.

The dependent claims are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from allowable independent claims. Thus, a detailed discussion of the additional distinguishing features recited in the dependent claims is not set forth at this time.

Early and favorable action with respect to this application is respectfully requested.

Should any questions arise in connection with this application or should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference with the undersigned would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues pertaining to this application the undersigned respectfully requests that he be contacted at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: June 27, 2008

By: Peter T. deVore
Matthew L. Schneider
Registration No. 32814

Peter T. deVore
Registration No. 60361

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620